VZCZCXRO5528 RR RUEHAG RUEHDF RUEHLZ DE RUEHRL #1483/01 3270713 ZNR UUUUU ZZH R 230713Z NOV 09 FM AMEMBASSY BERLIN TO RUEHC/SECSTATE WASHDC 5853 INFO RHEHAAA/WHITE HOUSE WASHINGTON DC RUEKJCS/SECDEF WASHINGTON DC RHEFDIA/DIA WASHINGTON DC RUEAIIA/CIA WASHINGTON DC RUEATRS/DEPT OF TREASURY WASHINGTON DC RUCNFRG/FRG COLLECTIVE RUEHBS/AMEMBASSY BRUSSELS 1751 RUEHLO/AMEMBASSY LONDON 0468 RUEHFR/AMEMBASSY PARIS 0987 RUEHRO/AMEMBASSY ROME 2494 RUEHNO/USMISSION USNATO 1510 RUEHVEN/USMISSION USOSCE 0680 RHMFIUU/HQ USAFE RAMSTEIN AB GE RHMFISS/HQ USEUCOM VAIHINGEN GE//J5 DIRECTORATE (MC)// RHMFISS/CDRUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GE RUKAAKC/UDITDUSAREUR HEIDELBERG GE UNCLAS SECTION 01 OF 07 BERLIN 001483 STATE FOR INR/R/MR, EUR/PAPD, EUR/PPA, EUR/CE, INR/EUC, INR/P, SECDEF FOR USDP/ISA/DSAA, DIA FOR DC-4A VIENNA FOR CSBM, CSCE, PAA "PERISHABLE INFORMATION -- DO NOT SERVICE" SIPDIS E.O. 12958: N/A TAGS: OPRC KMDR KPAO AF XF IR KN US EU KGHG
SUBJECT: MEDIA REACTION: AFGHANISTAN, MIDDLE EAST, IRAN, DPRK, U.S.-ASIA, EU, ENVIRONMENT; BERLIN <u>¶</u>1. Lead Stories Summary <u>¶</u>2. President Karzai's Inauguration (Afghanistan) (Middle East) <u>¶</u>3. Israeli Settlement Policy ¶4. (Iran) Nuclear Conflict (DPRK) ¶5. Obama Warning <u>¶</u>6. (U.S.-Asia) Obama Trip EU Top Jobs **1**7. (EU) **¶8.** (Environment) Copenhagen Conference <u>¶</u>1. Lead Stories Summary Print media opened with reports on the special EU summit in Brussels and the inauguration of Afghanistan's President Karzai. Editorials focused on the same issues. ZDF-TV's early evening newscast Heute opened with a report on President Karzai taking his oath of office, while ARD-TV's early evening newscast Tagesschau opened with a story on the beginning of the talks of EU leaders in Brussels <u>¶</u>2. (Afghanistan) President Karzai's Inauguration All papers (11/20) carried lengthy reports on President Karzai's inauguration emphasizing that the president promised to fight corruption and drug trafficking. Die Welt headlined; "Afghanistan's President Promises to Fight Corruption," Sueddeutsche carried a frontpage report under the headline: "Karzai Promises the West Improvement." Frankfurter Allgemeine opened with a report on its front page, headlined: "Karzai: In Five Years We Are Better Off."

Many Papers also carried editorials on Karzai's promises.

Deutschlandfunk (11/19) broadcast the following commentary: "The fact

that Foreign Minister Westerwelle traveled to Kabul to attend the inauguration of Afghan President Karzai signals his support for a politician who has been kept in office because of electoral fraud.

But NATO set out to bring democracy to Afghanistan. TQay's presence $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) \left(1\right)$

of a few ministers with Secretary Hillary Clinton at the helm is sending the wrong signals. The western states did not want to bring

this form of democracy to Afghanistan. Nevertheless, Karzai is needed

in order to implement at least a few steps towards a positive development in Afghanistan. He must be taken at his word, and he must

now do what he said and what he is being told. But the political and $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1\right$

military opposition will now present him as a puppet of the western

world. He will thus lose the remaining support he still enjoys in the

country. That is why the world must now pin its hopes on the regional $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

representatives and do so much more than in the past."

Regional radio station Westdeutscher Rundfunk of Cologne (11/19) commented: "The international community and Afghan President Karzai

are joined together like Siamese twins. Either they will have joint $$\tt BERLIN\ 00001483\ 002\ OF\ 007\ }$

successes, or they will fail together. The only chance for both sides

to succeed is that they clearly know that this is our last chance. In

his inaugural speech, Karzai addressed the main things even though in

vague terms. It looked as if Clinton, Westerwelle, and Miliband proofread the speech and were thus its authors. Taliban, corruption.

women's rights, everything was included. But Karzai will be measured

against his deeds. He must now quickly prove to the Afghans that he

is serious about them."

Frankfurter Allgemeine (11/20) said in a front-page editorial headlined "Oath of Disclosure" that "In view of the discrepancy between the high stakes and the disappointing result, the international community is losing patience with President Karzai and

his government. Never before has a president, after his election, received so many rebukes from his allies in his congratulatory mail.

The governments in Washington, London, and Berlin know this and, nevertheless, they are discussing exit strategies. The powers that be

on either side of the Atlantic are aware that the previous policy is

no option; each of them wants to get out of Afghanistan because their

peoples want them to get out. By reinforcing their troops, the Americans and British think they can decide and end their campaign with one final great battle.... But Afghanistan's stability is closely

linked to that of Pakistan. And this is the main reason why the West

cannot be indifferent to Afghanistan's fate in the future, even though

there is nothing the West would rather be."

According to Die Welt (11/20), "the statements of many western politicians demonstrate how disillusioned the NATO partners have become about a politician who was once their man in Kabul and is now

considered a problem. That is why Karzai at least tried in his inaugural speech to make concessions to the West. Following its experience with Karzai over the past few years, the West is well advised to remind him of these promises.... But the most important

thing is that the West gets out of this stage of a lack of orientation. A mission that has no goal and no direction is doomed to failure."

Sueddeutsche Zeitung (11/20) opined: "Karzai's speech does not mean a thing. The downtrodden country will not move ahead with words. The

president has been at the helm in Afghanistan for more than eight years now. This is one truth. The other one is: The West, too, made

mistakes because it pinned its hopes only on Karzai. But power in Afghanistan rests not primarily with the president but with the tribes

in the regions. An understanding, including with the Taliban, will be

BERLIN 00001483 003 OF 007

possible only if regional approaches are strengthened and if the president reduces his claim for power. Karzai's plan to organize a

Lorja Jirga, which he can moderate, is the right approach."

In the view of Handelsblatt (11/20), "the West developed a carrot-and-

stick policy for President Karzai. The carrot is the warm words and

continuing flow of money. The stick is the threat of a troop withdrawal and the open attempt to bypass Karzai and to directly influence the provincial leaders. This looks familiar to us, because

such methods were also frequently used in the past, the last time in Iraq."

Berliner Zeitung (11/20) opined: "The Afghanistan that the West would

like to get and will probably get some day in the future will be an

undemocratic Afghanistan. It will be a country in which corruption

remains essential for the fabric of society; it will be a country in

which women have no rights, and in which gangs rule. But it will be a country in which security forces are so strong that they will be

able to prevent the development of new terrorist training camps, thus

to prevent the development of new terrorist training camps, thus reducing the danger of attacks in the U.S. and Europe. This is what

it is all about eight years after the beginning of the adventure in

Afghanistan. It is not democracy, not the rule of law; it is only security, our security."

13. (Middle East) Israeli Settlement Policy

Under the sub-headline: "Barack Obama's Middle East Diplomacy is About

to Fail," Tagesspiegel (11/20) editorialized: "Measured against the

things that are obvious in the Middle East, Barack Obama's Middle East

policy is surprisingly dilettantish, even though his [Mideast policy]

began very favorably with George Mitchell's appointment, with his speech in Cairo where Obama presented himself as an honest broker and

with his move to wrestle the two-state concession from Benjamin

Netanyahu. But afterwards he lost his political instinct. Indeed,

Barack Obama is now faced with a pile of debris that is even bigger

than it was at the beginning of his term. In Israel, his reputation

is at an all-time low and in the Arab world his popularity has suffered. But this is not all. The fuse is burning at the second trouble spot in the region: Iran, which has now rejected the western

offer in the nuclear conflict. Has Obama a Plan B with respect to his

relations with the Mullahs? Only two weeks ago, a giant arms shipment

to the Hezbollah militia force in Lebanon was exposed. And even

BERLIN 00001483 004 OF 007

did not prompt Washington to change course. There are mounting indications that Obama's policy of an extended hand is faced with a

debacle."

¶4. (Iran) Nuclear Conflict

Handelsblatt (11/20) headlined: "U.S. is getting impatient with Iran," $\,$

and added in its intro: "In the nuclear dispute, Iran must prepare itself for new sanctions. After Tehran's rejection of the compromise

deal, Barack Obama noted that he is losing his patience." Under the

headline "Back in the old trenches," Frankfurter Rundschau (11/20) analyzed: "The cat has now been let out of the bag. The uranium compromise between the Vienna authority and the Islamic Republic has

fallen through. The intermezzo of diplomatic rapprochement is

The deal would have been good for both sides. Iran would have gotten

civilian nuclear technology and the world community the assurance that

Teheran does not produce a nuclear bomb in the predictable future as

it would lack fissile material. The nuclear dispute would have been

resolved - at least for the time being. This is off. Following a tough dispute among Tehran's conservatives, Ayatollah Khamenei obviously ended the dispute with his unusually harsh attack on the U.S. on the 30th anniversary of the seizure of the American embassy.

All sides involved are now back in their old trenches. The Iranian

regime is again enjoying itself in the position of a lonesome fighter $% \left(1\right) =\left(1\right) +\left(1$

against everybody, while the West is getting ready for a new round of sanctions."

15. (DPRK) Obama Warning

Under the headline "Nice Words," Frankfurter Allgemeine (11/20) commented: "Barack Obama concealed his warning with a lot of sweetness, sending his special envoy Bosworth to Pyongyang. He will

apparently get the message there that Washington is no longer

to accept North Korea's tactics of the recent years. The problem is

that Bosworth's visit to Pyongyang is the result of these North Korean $\,$

tactics. They were reportedly enraged and left the negotiating table

at the six party talks. They now make their gracious return dependent

on the talks with the Americans. If Obama were consistent, he would

send his envoy to China.... Bosworth could suggest that there would

something valuable for North Korea at a table in China. Some kind of

a dtente could be the result. Let's not believe in a denuclearization of North Korea. What would Pyongyang have left if it

gave away its greatest asset?"

BERLIN 00001483 005 OF 007

16. (U.S.-Asia) Obama Trip

Norddeutscher Rundfunk radio of Hamburg (11/19) commented: "Barack Obama bowed deeply - too deep to Japan's emperor. Obama's bow to the

Tenno in Tokyo is the picture that will remain from his mammoth tour

to Japan, China, Singapore, and South Korea: Obama degrading himself

and very small, almost a caricature of himself. This is a snapshot

that summarizes Obama's eight days in Asia and that depicts a president who, in the strongholds of Asian politeness, wanted to do

everything right and use the right forms and who, for this reason, did

not succeed in doing something right, but only played the tunes of his

hosts. It was a weak performance in Asia, measured against the performances of his predecessors. China as an economic power has become more self-confident, tougher and even more uncompromising. It

knows that Obama needs the bundles of dollars from Chinese safes to

finance its record debt policy with money that is used to finance rescue and bailout programs for everyone. That is why Obama's latitude in Beijing was restricted right from the start. Obama is right to be really annoyed at China because it manipulates its currency in order to make Chinese goods even cheaper than they are

to stymie any competition. But this currency scandal should at

have shown up in one phrase in the minutes, which it did not. It is

no coincidence that Obama's so-called news conferences were de facto

nothing but empty communiqus.... Obama, who likes to speak so brilliantly, simply had nothing to say. And this speaks volumes about

the trip of a deeply bowed president to Asia."

17. (EU) EU Top Jobs

ARD-TV's Tagesthemen (11/19) opined: "The result of the negotiations

had a price: two people were nominated for the future EU top jobs, who

have had no opportunity in the past to develop their profiles.... They

might become good people, but nobody yet knows them... There seems to

be a clear will within Europe not to appoint too powerful people to

these positions. European leaders don't want to be upstaged by 'those

in Brussels.' Berlin, Paris, London and other national capitals want

to continue to play a strong role. The appointments of the two EU

top jobs seem to guarantee this.... There were more distinguished leaders."

Frankfurter Allgemeine (11/20) wrote in a front-page editorial: "This

team of a conservative from a traditionally pro-European member states

BERLIN 00001483 006 OF 007

and a Social Democrat from a traditionally skeptical member is clearly

an old-school compromise, so the evening did not go on forever as feared. Only the Eastern Europeans went home with empty hands.... Is

this now the EU that was strengthened by the Lisbon Treaty and that

will now give Europe more weight during international summits? Both

politicians have achieved honorable things: Prime Minister van Rompuy's great achievement is to have led the Belgian government into

still waters. The way Catherine Ashton's pushed the Lisbon Treaty through the cliffs of the Upper House was also no small achievement.

However, can these two faces personify the new beginning government

leaders promised when they defended the EU reform against all the criticism and lethargy in nation states? The words 'European constitution' were too big for the text of the Lisbon Treaty. The words 'European president' also seem to be too big."

Berliner Zeitung's (11/20) editorial remarked under the headlined "Two

nobodies for Europe" that the decision is "disappointing," adding:
"The community has picked leaders without personality, without
visions, and partly at least without experience. Future Council
President van Rompuy is an honorable Belgian man who skillfully kept

his country together. He is not a heavyweight in Europe and the world. The heads of states and governments looked for an administrator. The appointment of Catherine Ashton is even more disappointing. The future chief diplomat has never before dealt with

classic foreign diplomacy. The facts that she is a Social Democrat,

comes from Britain and is a woman were sufficient for her nomination.

It did not play a role whether she is well plugged-in and knows the

right people in government. The EU wants to be strong at home and abroad. Looking at van Rompuy and Mrs. Ashton suggests that this will not be the case."

Tagesspiegel (11/20) bemoaned in a front-page editorial: "Luxemburg

Prime Minister Juncker would have been the perfect choice for the post

of the EU Council president. He is a powerful expert of the European

mechanisms, who, above all, also represents a small country. The EU

has gambled away the opportunity the Lisbon Treaty had offered. It

would have been the time to appoint men and women to the posts of the

EU with its 500 million people whose word would be heard throughout

the world and who could create new confidence between the Europeans

and the institutions in Brussels."

Under the headline "Two Under Secretaries for Europe," FT Deutschland

(11/20) editorialized on the front page: "Herman who? Catherine who?

BERLIN 00001483 007 OF 007

Most Europeans have never heard the names of the EU council

president

and the high representative before. Chancellor Merkel, President Sarkozy and their European colleagues could have picked more charismatic people for the new top jobs, which were created by the Lisbon Treaty. They deliberately decided against it. They were looking for under secretaries who can act in the background and are

not international showoffs. Belgian Prime Minister van Rompuy and $\mathop{\hbox{\rm EU}}$

Trade Commissioner Ashton met these job descriptions. The choice of

unknown candidates shows that the powerful government leaders do not

want to be outshone by European officials. During EU and G20 summits,

Merkel and Co. don't want to share the limelight with the EU Council

president and the high representative.... However, the decision might

not necessarily be bad. The fact that the 27 EU leaders reached an

agreement within hours is a good signal. After the weeks of disputes,

many had expected a night-long struggle without any results. The Flemish leader van Rompuy has shown an impressive talent to meditate

compromises. This talent will be helpful in the efforts to moderate

the disputes of the state and government leaders. Ashton's nomination

also has indisputable advantages: as a permanent member of the UN Security Council, Britain is one of Europe's heavyweights. Hardly any

other country can contribute to increase Europe's might and credibility in international diplomacy."

18. (Environment) Copenhagen Conference

In the view of Frankfurter Allgemeine (11/20) "the chancellor feels

her own commitment that, if there is anybody, who is able and willing

to achieve a success in Copenhagen, then it is herself. It should not

be decisive whether Barack Obama takes the trouble to travel to Copenhagen or whether China is willing to make any kind of concessions. The Europeans and some other nations will follow her because her arguments are more farsighted than the ones of her opponents. And, as long as she is convinced that her arguments are

true, she will stick to her goals — for the benefit of future generations."

MURPHY